

In the United States Court of Federal Claims  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS  
Filed: October 29, 2021

\* \* \* \* \*

STEVEN CORWIN,	*	No. 20-491V
	*	
Petitioner,	*	Special Master Sanders
v.	*	
	*	
SECRETARY OF HEALTH	*	Ruling on Entitlement; Influenza
AND HUMAN SERVICES,	*	(“Flu”) Vaccine; Guillain-Barré
	*	Syndrome (“GBS”)
Respondent.	*	
	*	

\* \* \* \* \*

*Theodore J. Hong*, Maglio Christopher & Toale, Seattle, WA, for Petitioner.  
*Jennifer L. Reynaud*, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

**RULING ON ENTITLEMENT<sup>1</sup>**

On April 23, 2020, Steven Corwin (“Petitioner”) filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program<sup>2</sup> (“Vaccine Program” or “Program”). 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-10 to 34 (2012). Petitioner alleged that the influenza (“flu”) vaccine he received on October 30, 2018, caused him to develop Guillain-Barré Syndrome (“GBS”), a Table injury. *See Pet.*, ECF No. 1.

On August 12, 2021, Respondent filed his report pursuant to Vaccine Rule 4(c). Resp’t’s Report, ECF No. 22. Respondent “recommend[ed] that compensation be awarded.” *Id.* at 1. He stated that his “position [is] that [P]etitioner has satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table (‘Table’) and the Qualifications and Aids to Interpretation (‘QAI’).” *Id.* at 7. Respondent specified that “[t]he scope of damages to be awarded is limited to [P]etitioner’s GBS and its related sequelae only.” *Id.*

A special master may determine whether a petitioner is entitled to compensation based upon the record. A hearing is not required. §300aa-13; Vaccine Rule 8(d). In light of Respondent’s

---

<sup>1</sup> This Ruling shall be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Ruling will be available to anyone with access to the Internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), a party has 14 days to identify and move to delete medical or other information that satisfies the criteria in § 300aa-12(d)(4)(B). Further, consistent with the rule requirement, a motion for redaction must include a proposed redacted ruling. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within the requirements of that provision, such material will be deleted from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755 (“the Vaccine Act” or “Act”). Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

concession and a review of the record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation. This matter shall now proceed to the damages phase.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Herbrina D. Sanders  
Herbrina D. Sanders  
Special Master